



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

11A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/823,939

04/14/2004

John William Krawczyk

2004-0090.02

5281

21972

7590

07/12/2006

LEXMARK INTERNATIONAL, INC.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPARTMENT
740 WEST NEW CIRCLE ROAD
BLDG. 082-1
LEXINGTON, KY 40550-0999

EXAMINER

MARTIN, LAURA E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2853

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/823,939	Applicant(s) KRAWCZYK ET AL.	
	Examiner Laura E. Martin	Art Unit 2853	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-16, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beerling (5861902).

Beerling et al. discloses the following claim limitations:

As per claims 1-3, 8-10, and 14-16, Beerling teaches a micro-fluid ejection assembly, a substrate for an ink jet printhead heater chip, and a microfluid ejection assembly having a silicon substrate (column 7, line 61-column 8, line 9; figures 3a-3g) having accurately formed fluid paths therein, the fluid paths being formed by an etching process conducted on a substrate having a surface characteristic selected from the group consisting of a dielectric layer thickness of no more than about 5000 Angstroms and a substantially dielectric material free pitted surface wherein a root mean square depth of surface pitting is less than about 500 Angstroms and a maximum surface pitting depth is no more than about 2500 Angstroms (column 9, lines 1-47). Beerling also teaches the surface characteristic comprising an oxide thickness ranging from 200 to 5000 Angstroms (column 9, lines 34-47).

Beerling et al. does not disclose the following claim limitations:

In this particular embodiment, Beerling does not teach the etching process to be deep reactive ion etching.

In another embodiment Beerling teaches the etching to be a dry etching (column 14, lines 1-15). Wang et al. (US 20020113846) teaches dry etching and deep reactive ion etching to be the identical processes [0011].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use deep reactive ion etching (or dry etching) as the preferred method of etching on all embodiments taught by Beerling, to improve the quality of the fluid paths.

Claims 4, 11, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beerling (5861902) in view of Haas et al. (US 5143577).

Beerling et al. discloses the following claim limitations:

A micro-fluid ejection assembly and substrate, wherein a maximum surface pitting depth is no more than about 2500 Angstroms (column 9, lines 1-6).

Beerling et al. does not disclose the following claim limitations:

The surface characteristic comprises a substantially oxide free pitted surface wherein a root mean square depth of surface pitting is less than about 500 Angstrom and a maximum surface pitting depth is no more than about 2500 Angstroms.

Haas et al. discloses the following claim limitations:

The surface characteristic comprises a substantially oxide free pitted surface wherein a root mean square depth of surface pitting is less than about 500 Angstrom

Art Unit: 2853

sand a maximum surface pitting depth is no more than about 2500 Angstroms (column 4, lines 9-13 and figure 1b, elements 13, 16, and 17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the assembly and substrate taught by Beerling et al. with the disclosure of Haas et al. in order to create a smoother surface to simplify printing.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laura E. Martin whose telephone number is (571) 272-2160. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:00 - 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen D. Meier can be reached on (571) 272-2149. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2853

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Laura E. Martin

 7/7/06
MANISH S. SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER